



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/730,612	12/05/2000	Dave Stephens	ORCL-2000-063-01	7393
7590	12/23/2004		EXAMINER	
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP			FADOK, MARK A	
Third Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Two North Market Street				
San Jose, CA 95113			3625	

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	D
	09/730,612	STEPHENS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark Fadok	3625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/10/2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The examiner is in receipt of applicant's response to office action mailed 5/10/2004, which was received, 9/10/2004. Acknowledgement is made to the amendment to claims 1 and 10 leaving claims 1-19 as pending in the instant application. The applicant's arguments and amendments have been carefully considered, but were not found to be persuasive; therefore, the previous rejection modified as necessitated by amendment follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn (5,897,622) in view of Official Notice.

Blinn discloses all the all the features of the instant claims except as follows:

Blinn teaches a common interface that allows multiple merchants to customize their web presents yet offers common modules for accomplishing a web presents (see abstract FIG 2 and summary). Blinn however does not teach the use of XML as a communications protocol. It was old and well known at the time of the instant invention

to use XML as a web protocol, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include in Blinn the use of XML, because the use of XML improves the functionality of the web and would provide greater flexibility in organizing and presenting information than is possible with the older HTML document coding method.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/23/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant once again argues that Blinn does not teach multiple exchanges sharing a common instance. The examiner introduces applicant's own definitions of the terms "exchanges" and "common instance" to clarify the meaning of these terms.

Applicant defines "exchanges" as electronic commerce websites, see page 4, lines 16 and 17.

Applicant further defines 'the term "common instance" as referred to herein is a logical concept representing the fact that the data structures comprising the exchanges 201–204 reside within a common "schema" that defines the contents of the database. As known by those skilled in the art, the term "schema" refers to a definition of an entire database. The schema defines the structure and type of contents that each data element within the structure can contain (e.g., table structures, etc.)' (page 14, lines 10-20).

In the contexts of applicant's own disclosure, Blinn clearly teaches a database schema that allows a plurality of merchants sites (exchanges) with disparate functionality to use one site that permits the merchants to share common functionality (see FIG 2, abstract and summary).

Furthermore, applicant argues the newly added feature "wherein each of the exchanges is configured as a sub-scheme a providing a partial view of the common instance. The examiner disagrees and directs applicant's attention to FIG 5 and item 125, that composes a page for display by processing a template having a database request for page data. This is considered equivalent to applicant's sub-schemas that provide a partial view or customized view of the entire database (applicant's PGPUB 20020069120, para 0033), by providing information to customize the common schema and individualize the presence of the uncommon merchant utilizing a common database.

Conclusion

The addition of applicant's added features in claims 1 and 11 as submitted in the Request for Continued Examination were carefully considered, but are finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in of the previous office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mark Fadok** whose telephone number is **(703) 605-4252**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Thursday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wynn Coggins** can be reached on **(703) 308-1344**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Receptionist** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-1113**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 [Official communications; including

After Final communications labeled
"Box AF"]

(703) 746-7206 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal
Drive, Arlington, VA, 7th floor receptionist.



Mark Fadok

Patent Examiner